



METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY

METRO HISTORIC ZONING COMMISSION SUMMARY MEETING MINUTES

Metropolitan Historic Zoning Commission
Sunnyside in Sevier Park
3000 Granny White Pike
Nashville, Tennessee 37204
Telephone: (615) 862-7970
Fax: (615) 862-7974

February 19, 2014

Commissioners Present: Ann Nielson, Vice-chair, Menié Bell, Rose Cantrell, Richard Fletcher, Hunter Gee, Aaron Kaalberg

Zoning Staff: Sean Alexander, Melissa Baldock, Paul Hoffman, Robin Zeigler (Historic Zoning Administrator), Jon Michaels (City Attorney)

Applicants: Mitch Hodge, Derek Hoevel, Robin York, John Root, William and Toni Gant, Matt Schutz, David Baird, Preston Quirk, Michael Ward

Council Member: Scott Davis

Public:

Vice-Chairperson Nielson called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. and read aloud the processes for appealing the decisions of the Metro Historic Zoning Commission and the time limits on presentations.

MINUTES:

Commissioner Bell moved to approve the January 15, 2014 minutes without changes. Commissioner Gee seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chairperson Nielson read aloud the process for the Consent Agenda, explaining that 2009 19th Avenue North was removed based on public comment.

RECOGNITION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS:

Councilmember Scott Davis spoke in support of the new construction proposed for 919 McFerrin. He explained that there were homes of this style in the neighborhood prior to the overlay and that the neighborhood association has approved the project.

I. CONSENT AGENDA

Staff member, Paul Hoffman, read the projects for the Consent Agenda. There were no requests from the public for any items to be removed.

2008 19TH AVENUE SOUTH

Application: New construction--addition to outbuilding; Conversion to detached accessory dwelling unit

Council District: 18

Overlay: Belmont-Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1960810

2009 19TH AVENUE SOUTH

Application: Setback determination
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER
Permit ID #: 1960366

129 SOUTH 11TH STREET

Application: New construction - addition
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN
Permit ID #: 1960365

1300 FATHERLAND STREET

Application: New construction--outbuilding
Council District: 06
Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1960797

1501 FERGUSON AVENUE

Application: Partial demolition--additions; New construction-addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1960800

1707 PRIMROSE AVENUE

Application: Partial demolition; New construction-addition
Council District: 18
Overlay: Belmont Hillsboro Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK
Permit ID #: 1960802

618 FATHERLAND STREET

Application: New construction—outbuilding, Detached accessory dwelling unit
Council District: 06
Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay
Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER
Permit ID #: 1955734

Motion:

Commissioner Cantrell moved to approve all items on the Consent Agenda, with the exception of 2009 19th Avenue North, and with the applicable conditions. Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

2009 19TH Avenue North

Ms. Zeigler noted that the case was pulled from the consent agenda because there had been a call from the applicant about the project. She explained that the design of the garage has been approved by the Commission, but the applicant was returning to ask to allow the building to be 4' closer to the rear property line. She explained that the proposed location was typical of historic outbuildings and consistent with past decisions.

Mitch Hodge, architect for the project, stated that the reason for the request was the existence of an existing foundation poured by the previous owner and that other outbuildings have been allowed in the neighborhood in similar locations.

Motion:

Commissioner Gee moved to approve the setback determination. Commissioner Fletcher seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

1719 5TH AVENUE NORTH

Application: Violation and exterior alterations

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: ROBIN ZEIGLER

Permit ID #: 1960362

Robin Zeigler, historic zoning administrator, explained the violation and other alteration requests for 1719 5th Avenue North. There are several alterations planned for windows and doors, which are explained in the staff recommendation and which staff found met the design guidelines based on historic evidence, with the exception of altering the size of the front door.

The project includes the removal of a non-historic outbuilding, which meets the design guidelines.

The front addition does not meet the guidelines and is in violation because the construction is nearly completed based on a misunderstanding of the scope of work allowed for an interior-only building permit.

The partial demolition that precipitated the removal of the front slope and porch of the building does not meet the design guidelines since these are character defining features.

The addition does not meet section II.2.A and f. This portion of the house is now almost two feet taller (1' 10 ½") than it was originally. To be approved, additions should generally be located at the rear, and in some cases could be located at the side, of a historic building. With the exception of replacing missing porches, front additions have not been approved on historic buildings by the Commission in the past. In addition, the front addition alters the existing roofline so it is not removable without altering the form of the house. The project does not meet section II.B.2.a and f.

The project does not meet section II.B.1.e for appropriate roof form because the original roof form of a cross-gable with a shed roof porch has been altered to a cross-gable with a shed roof dormer and a recessed porch.

In summary, Staff recommends removal of the non-historic outbuilding and alteration of the existing window dimensions and side door dimensions, based on historic evidence and with the condition that staff approval the final window and door design and materials. Staff recommends disapproval of the alteration of the primary entrance dimensions and the front addition based on the fact that it does not meet sections V.B.1, II.B.1.e and 2.a and f and further recommends reconstruction of the original roof and porch.

Commissioner Kaalberg clarified that the owner had not received a Preservation Permit.

Derek Hoevel, owner of the property, handed out information about his building permit. He stated that he had been working on the house for two months before he received a stop-work-order, without notice. He claimed that he went online to find out if the property was in an overlay and presented screen-shots to show that it was not. Commissioners informed him that what he presented were not the boundaries for the Salemtown Overlay. Ms. Zeigler pulled up a live map and stated that the online mapping was live and correct. She also explained that a map and design guidelines were posted on the website prior to the adoption of the overlay so that people could review them.

He made the argument that the property has significantly changed over the year and that Staff was incorrect in stating that the building permit stated that the work for “interior only” when in fact is simply says “rehab of interior.” He feels singled out and discriminated against compared to the new construction in the area. He also made the argument that he was not informed that the property was in the overlay; however, several commissioners noted that it was clearly listed on his building permit. Commissioner Gee asked how much money was spent on the dormer and Mr. Hoevel said it was in the thousands and he and his family did the work themselves. Commissioner Fletcher stated that the cost of the work, as noted in the building permit, would send a flag that the work was likely very simple.

Commissioner Gee asked if a representative of the Codes Administration was present and if she had talked with anyone from Codes. Ms. Zeigler explained that the building department’s process wasn’t really relevant since that was not a process that the MHZC had any authority over. In this case, the applicant did not obtain a Preservation Permit before beginning work.

The applicant continued to dispute what the building department’s permit covered. He stated that he spoke with the director of the Codes Administration, who told him that he didn’t think that this was right, how it all unfolded. According to Mr. Hoevel, someone with the MHZC stated that they had talked with the owner multiple times, but he has not talked with anyone in the department and the previous owner also stated that he hadn’t talked with anyone. Commissioner Bell and Vice-chair Nielson asked if staff had talked with the previous owner. Ms. Zeigler explained that the previous owner had come to them with questions about an addition and they had talked with him about different options but it is not necessarily the responsibility of the previous owner to tell a new buyer about an overlay.

In response to Mr. Hoevel’s assertions that he did not receive prior notice about the stop-work order, Ms. Zeigler explained that the purpose of a stop-work order is to address a violation immediately and assure that work does not continue on a violation. Prior notice is never sent.

Mr. Hoevel stated that he told the Codes department that it would include a dormer. Vice-chairperson Nielson asked if he had that in writing and he said he did not.

Commissioners Fletcher and Kaalberg asked if there was a solution that had been explored with Staff and Commissioner Kaalberg stated that they have never seen a case like this before. Mr. Hoevel responded that the options given to him were to reconstruct the original conditions or to come before the Commission. Ms. Zeigler explained that the reason they don’t see these types of cases is because there typically is some type of solution that can be worked out and the applicant complies. In this case, because of the type and location of work, there is no solution but to reconstruct the original design. Ms. Zeigler reiterated that a front addition has never been approved.

Ms. Zeigler, in answer to a question from Vice-chair Nielson, stated that a review of whether or not the building was historic had been done by Staff.

Mr. Hoevel, noted that Appendix H of his handout shows that there is new construction on both sides of him and his home is the most historic looking one, even with his dormer.

Commissioner Gee said he understood but he thought the new homes were evidence of the reason that people wanting to have the overlay. He said staff has done what they are charged with doing and not necessarily finding a compromise that will be in opposition to the design guidelines. Commissioner Kaalberg asked the applicant if he wanted to defer so that he could return with the Codes reviewer. Jon Michael, in answer to commissioner’s Gee question, explained that once the board takes an action, the applicant has the ability to appeal the decision to chancery court. The applicant could also defer. Commissioner Cantrell stated that she wasn’t prepared to make a decision because she isn’t hearing the other side. She

invited the applicant to defer. He said that he would be happy to do that but he thought the Codes reviewer has retired and he has taken off from work and would like a decision today.

Commissioner Kaalberg stated that based on the building permit the decision is easy because the permit says “interior” and states that the property is in a historic overlay.

Vice-chair Nielson warned that their decision must still be based on the design guidelines, even if there was a mistake. Commissioner Cantrell agreed that the Codes inspector’s testimony might not make a difference.

Mr. Hoevel asked for a deferral, to bring another witness or additional information and Vice-chairperson Nielson agreed.

1818 5TH AVENUE NORTH

Application: New construction - infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1960883

Mr. Alexander, staff for the Commission, presented the case for new construction at 1818 5th Avenue North. The form of the building is basically a gabled-ell, with a two-story massing on the right side and one and one-half story on the left. He presented newer drawings showing several minor changes. The higher eave will be 21’ and the lower eave will be 11’. Staff felt that the lower eave height gave the appearance that the second story was taller than the first, and recommends as a condition that the porch roof and eave be raised so that the proportions are more appropriate.

The two halves of the building will be offset, with the front edge of the building aligned with an existing historic house two doors to the north. The width is 36’ with a small bay on the left side projecting two feet. The site plan shows a detached garage at the rear of the lot. The applicant has discussed building a one-story, two-car garage, which likely could be approved administratively, but plans for it have not been submitted for review at this time. Staff finds the rhythm and proportion of windows on the side elevations, as well as the front, to be appropriate. The materials will be cement-fiber with a 5” reveal, asphalt shingle roof. Staff asks to administratively approve the roof color and texture, as well as unlabeled materials including the foundation, the porch columns, and porch floor, as well as windows and doors.

Staff recommended approval of the duplex infill with the following conditions:

- That the roof and eaves of the front porch be raised to make the perceived height of the first story taller, in relation to the upperstory;
- That the thickness of the porch floor and porch rack be increased to a size more compatible with nearby historic houses;
- Staff review and approve the roof color and the materials for the trim, as well as the porch columns, porch floor, and foundation;
- Staff review and approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation; and,
- The HVAC unit be placed at the rear, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

With these conditions, staff finds that the project meets Section III of the Salemtown Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook & Design Guidelines.

Mr. Alexander added that he met with the applicant on Tuesday and he has agreed to all conditions.

Commissioner Fletcher asked if Salemtown was different than most NCZOs. Ms. Zeigler and Commissioner Mosley explained that it was a little different, in the sense that there is only 1 two-story historic building in the neighborhood that would typically mean that new construction should be one to one and one-half stories but that in developing this district neighborhood the property owners wanted more deference to some of the new development that is already in existence.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- That the roof and eaves of the front porch be raised to make the perceived height of the first story taller, in relation to the upperstory;
- That the thickness of the porch floor and porch rack be increased to a size more compatible with nearby historic houses;
- Staff review and approve the roof color and the materials for the trim, as well as the porch columns, porch floor, and foundation;
- Staff review and approve all window and door selections prior to purchase and installation; and,
- The HVAC unit be placed at the rear, or on a side façade beyond the midpoint of the house.

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

Commissioner Gee left the meeting at 3:06 p.m.

612 MONROE STREET

Application: New construction - infill

Council District: 19

Overlay: Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1960889

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for a new multi-family development. There will be 10 units in total, within 7 buildings. Four buildings in the development will have frontage on Monroe Street (*images shown in PowerPoint*), and three buildings on 7th Avenue North. Units 3-4 on Monroe share a party wall, as do Units 6-7 on 7th Avenue. Unit 5 is a single unit, but faces both streets. Units 9-10 are also attached, but are in the interior of the lot. In order to engage the street properly, staff recommends as a condition of approval that a walkway be added from these units to one or both streets.

All of the buildings will be similar in materials, form, and overall character. They will be two and one-half stories tall with brick as the primary material, and will have arched doorways and stylized variations of parapeted gabled roofs. Within the gable forms, a portion of each building's roof will be left open to create an uncovered third story roof-deck area.

The height of the buildings vary because the lot drops approximately nine feet (9') from Monroe street going North, but generally the structures will all be between forty-one feet (41') and forty-four feet (44') tall from median grade to the peaks, with parapet heights of between thirty feet and thirty-three feet (30'-33'). These heights are compatible with several historic buildings nearby.

Generally, each unit will be 23' wide, with attached units being similar to the stand alone structures. The massing of Unit 5 differs from the others, as it extends across the secondary façade, but staff finds it be compatible with the context of existing structures at the corner. Likewise, the massing of units 9-10 has the 23' wide component, but the configuration is different because of its location at the alley instead of the street. Staff finds the height and massing of the proposed new buildings to be compatible with this historic context.

The new buildings would have similar roofs, although again they basically have a portion of the roof itself missing to create a 3rd level roof deck. Although not seen in the overlay, staff found that this technique was not visually contrasting on the structures with ridges oriented front-to-rear. These would have a gable "screen wall" to obscure the fact that the roof planes are missing. The mid-bock structures with side-oriented ridges would be perceived much like a typical side-gabled roof, which is also a common roof form.

Unit 5, however, would be much more visible because of its location at the corner. In the views of the building from 7th Avenue North in particular, the roof (or rather the absence of roof) behind the screen wall will be obvious, but not incompatible with roofs of historic buildings. Unit 5 would also have an unusual incongruity of roof forms with cross-gables and stepped parapets on half of the building, and the sculpted Dutch gables on the northern wing on the 7th avenue elevation.

The new buildings will be brick with brick rowlock and soldier course detailing, and with cast-stone coping and cornerstones. The buildings have brick-to-grade with a soldier course marking the foundation line... staff finds that this differentiation is not sufficient and that the material needs to be different in order to meet guideline 2.3. These materials are generally appropriate, but staff asks to approve samples for color and texture. The windows will be aluminum and the doors will be wood... which should be at least 50% glass as required by guideline 2.5.4

The windows are appropriate in their proportion and rhythm in general, but staff recommends that a window be added on this wall space here on Units 1, 2, and 8. No changes are recommended for windows of the other buildings.

Staff recommends approval of the application to construct a multi-family development at 612 Monroe Street with the conditions that:

- Walkways be added to connect the building at the rear of the lot to the street;
- That the front doors be at least half glass;
- That windows are added to the side elevations of the single-family buildings (Units 1, 2, 8);
- That the roof of the corner building (Unit 5) be revised to be more cohesive and not open at the corner;
- The location of HVAC units and other utilities, as well as the material of the driveway and other paving, fences, walls, exterior lights, and other appurtenances are approved by Staff.

Meeting those conditions, Staff finds that the application will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Germantown Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

Commissioner Mosley disclosed that he also designed a project for this site but for a different owner and so he did not feel it would affect his decision.

John Root, architect for the project, stated that they presented it to the Germantown Neighborhood Association and it was warmly embraced. The walkways requested by staff for connecting the “alley buildings” to the street do not work with the plan but they can add a walkway along the alley. The front door designs are not final and they will work with staff on those. He believes that they have accomplished the intent of staff’s window request. He doesn’t share the same concern as staff on the roof of unit 5 as there is a consistency in design that they want to continue. Similar appearances will be seen on the side streets on Units 8 and 1. They looked at wrapping the gable around the corner but it didn’t fit well. He recommends eliminating the gable entirely or leaving it as-is. He spoke to staff about operable partitions or sunscreens but that will be a request by the property owners on a case-by-case basis.

Commissioner Mosley asked if rafters could be used to give some weight to the corner building. John Root stated his concern that if additional members are added that would encourage someone to cover it with plastic sheeting.

There were no requests from the public to speak.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve based on the conditions that:

- The applicant works with staff on solutions to walkways, as presented by applicant;
- That the roof of the corner building (Unit 5) be revised to be more cohesive;
- That the front doors be at least half glass;
- That windows are added to the side elevations of the single-family buildings (Units 1, 2, 8); and
- The location of HVAC units and other utilities, as well as the material of the driveway and other paving, fences, walls, exterior lights, and other appurtenances are approved by Staff.

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously. (Commissioner Fletcher amended his original motion and Commissioner Bell seconded.)

Commissioners discussed what was meant by the “cohesive” recommendation from staff which led to a slight revision to the original motion.

417 PARK CIRCLE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District:

Overlay: Richland-West End Addition Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1960880

417 Park Circle was removed from the agenda.

919 MCFERRIN AVE

Application: New construction-infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1951882

Vice-chairperson Nielson noted that this was the case that Councilmember Davis spoke to at the beginning of the meeting.

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for infill construction at 919 McFerrin, an application to construct infill on a vacant lot. In December 2013, the Commission denied an application for infill at this site, but approved an outbuilding. This application is a new design for the infill by the same applicant. Staff is again recommending disapproval of the project. The infill meets all base zoning setbacks. Staff finds that the house's height and scale are appropriate to the historic context. However, staff is recommending disapproval of the project because several key aspects of the design do not meet the design guidelines. First and foremost, the house's flat roof form does not meet the design guidelines. The design guidelines state that *Roof pitches should be similar to the pitches found in the district. Historic roofs are generally between 6/12 and 12/12.* There are no flat-roofed residential structures in the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay, and therefore the infill's flat roof form does not meet the historic context.

In addition, the primary material for the infill is proposed to be stucco. Staff did not identify any historic structure in the Greenwood conservation overlay with stucco as its primary material. The vast majority of the historic structures in the neighborhood have brick or lap siding as their primary material. There also is not a change in material from the foundation to the first floor level. Historic houses in the Greenwood area all have a change in material at the foundation level. The five foot (5') tall porch wall is also atypical for the Greenwood area. This type of tall wall creates a somewhat "enclosed" porch design which is more typical of architectural styles that are not found in this neighborhood. More characteristic in this district are porches with open railings or no railings and narrower posts, creating a more open feel. The infill's primary windows are generally twice as tall as they are wide, thereby meeting the historic proportion of window openings. One exception is a three foot by three foot (3' X 3') window opening on the front façade, to the left of the door. A window like this on the front façade should be at least twice as tall as it is wide. The front façade also has a window opening that is filled with shutters and wraps around the corner to the north/left façade. It is not clear if the shutters are fixed or if they are operable. Staff would need more information on the shutters before determining their appropriateness.

Ms. Baldock presented a drawing the applicant had submitted comparing the proposed design for 919 McFerrin to other houses. She noted that the two houses on the right were not located in the Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Staff recommends disapproval of the infill, finding that its tall porch wall height, lack of a defined foundation, flat roof form, stucco cladding, and proportion and rhythm of openings do not meet Section II.B.1. of the *Greenwood Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay: Handbook and Design Guidelines*. Staff finds that the basic massing, scale and layout of the house is appropriate and a simple alteration of roof form, materials and windows are all that are needed to meet the design guidelines. Although these alterations are simple to accomplish, they would radically alter the look of the building. This is the reason Staff is not recommending approval with conditions.

Ms. Baldock noted that the Neighborhood Association wrote a letter recommending approval that was passed out at the beginning of the meeting.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked what the difference was between allowing for roof forms that don't exist in Germantown, as was just approved, and this project, that also doesn't have a similar roof form in the district. Ms. Zeigler explained that they did find some context in Germantown for the proposed roof forms. Ms. Zeigler further explained that everyone thought that the drawings were greatly improved and that it is an attractive house, their recommendation was simply based on the design guidelines.

Commissioner Bell stated that it was clear that the councilmember and neighborhood thought the house to be appropriate and so they may want to consider changing their design guidelines to allow for this type of architecture.

William and Toni Gant, owners of the property, stated that there are more than 30 Spanish style buildings spread throughout East Nashville. They showed images of buildings that are no longer extant and some that probably used to have a flat roof that have since been altered.

Matt Schutz, designer of the project, explained that he was excited that the project included a green roof. He stated that a flat roof meets the design guidelines and that they will work with staff on the porch railing and the requested window alterations. His argument for the design meeting the design guidelines was based on:

- The design uses forms existing in the overlay;
- The design maintains the eclectic nature of the historic district;
- The scale and flat roof will not impede on the view shed of historic Lookaway, located nearby; and
- The Sanborn maps show that Greenwood and McFerrin were initially one neighborhood and the proposed style is found in McFerrin

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project based on the points that the current boundaries of the neighborhood are not historic and that similar buildings are found in the neighboring district, which was historically part of what is now known as Greenwood; the two adjacent homes are non-contributing homes; and because the location of this home and siting is unique due to its adjacency to a neighborhood thoroughfare; and with the condition:

- **Applicant works with staff to resolve the concerns of the inappropriate proportions of the three foot by three foot (3' X 3') window opening on the front façade, to the left of the door; and the front shuttered window.**

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

1406 HOLLY STREET

Application: New construction—Alteration to previously-approved infill

Council District: 05

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: MELISSA BALDOCK

Permit ID #: 1916066

Staff member, Melissa Baldock, presented the case for new construction at 1406 Holly Street, an application to amend a previously-approved design for infill. In April 2013, the Commission approved the demolition of a non-contributing structure at 1406 Holly Street, and approved the design of a single-family infill. The applicant would like to amend the previously-approved plans for the infill in order to construct a duplex on the site.

The larger site plan on the screen (*images shown*) is the new, proposed site plan. The smaller one beneath it is the previously-approved plan. Staff finds that the revised setbacks meet the design guidelines, but there are concerns about the width of the new design. The revised width is primarily thirty-six feet (36') wide; by comparison, the widths of neighboring historic buildings vary between twenty five and thirty three feet (25'-33').

Staff finds that the width of the revised infill does not meet the historic context, and staff asks that the house be reduced in width so that it no more than thirty-four feet (34') wide at the front for at least a depth of twenty feet (20'). The depth of the new design is 12 feet deeper than what was previously approved. Staff finds that the increase in the building's depth will not significantly impact the historic character of Holly Street. The previously approved site plan indicated that the applicant would keep the existing, non-historic outbuilding. The applicant is now proposing to demolish the outbuilding, which staff finds to be appropriate because it lacks historic character.

Here is the revised front façade (*shown*), with the previously-approved façade pasted in at a smaller size. The new design is one-and-a-half stories, with a ridge height that is six inches (6") taller than what was previously approved, for a total height of twenty-eight feet, six inches (28'6"). The design also includes a six foot (6') wide peak that is two feet, eight inches (2'8") taller than the primary ridge. Staff finds the slight increase in height of the structure to match the historic context along Holly Street, which varies greatly between seventeen and thirty-four feet (17'-34') tall from grade.

Since the infill will now be a duplex, an additional entrance has been added to the front façade. The porch wraps around to cover both entrances. No significant changes to the infill's materials were indicated on the drawings. All of the materials have been approved in the past by the Commission, and staff finds that they meet the design guidelines.

The fenestration pattern of the infill has not significantly changed in the redesign. Staff notes that the second story floor plan shows two windows in the side gables, but the elevation just shows one window. Staff asks that the drawings be corrected prior to issuance of the permit.

Staff recommends approval of the infill's redesign and the demolition of the outbuilding with the following conditions:

1. The width of the structure be reduced at the front to a maximum of thirty-four (34') feet for a depth of at least twenty feet (20');
2. The applicant submit revised drawings reconciling the window pattern on the floor plans and elevations.

John Root, architect for the project, explained that the request to change the approved design was due to an existing water line that goes beneath the house of which they were initially unaware. Because of the additional costs needed to remove the line, the developer now has to construct a duplex, to salvage the costs. The additional width requested is due to the additional width required for each addition and to keep the house at a 1.5 story plan.

Commissioner Mosley asked how the upper level porch will drain and Mr. Root explained that it will drain beneath the roof onto the porch.

Commissioner Kaalberg asked if other upper-level semi-enclosed porches have been approved in the past and Ms. Zeigler Vice-chairperson Nielson stated that there was one at Prentice and Grantland and another on Shelby Street.

Mr. Root clarified that the house was also pushed back further than it was originally because of the sewer easement. The commission requested several clarifications of the need and intent of the project.

Commissioner Kaalberg stated that the scale of the original proposal barely fit into the context so he believes that reducing the width is important. Requiring it to be set back 15' instead of 20' might be a good compromise.

Motion

Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve with the condition that the width of the structure be reduced at the front to a maximum of 34' for a depth of at least 15' and the applicant submit revised drawings reconciling the window pattern on the floor plans and elevations. Commissioner Mosley seconded and the motion was passed unanimously.

1112 & 1114 LILLIAN ST

Application: New construction -infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1955621

Staff member, Sean Alexander presented the case for a infill construction at 1112 and 1114 Lillian St. Alexander pointed out that the Commission heard applications for new construction on the same two lots last month and they were both disapproved. These lots were unusually narrow and dropped significantly toward the rear.

The applicant has revised the plans from two stories to one and one-half stories with a maximum roof height of twenty-nine feet (29') above grade with eaves at fifteen feet (15'). Staff finds this to be more in keeping with the scale of the surrounding context.

The materials and the fenestration are appropriate for both, with one of the buildings having cement-fiber shingle siding to differentiate the two.

Staff recommends approval of the application to construct new one and one-half story houses at 1112 and 1114 Lillian Street. Mr. Alexander explained that originally staff recommended conditions regarding windows and materials, but the applicant has already made revisions based on those comments.

Staff finds that those most recent drawings, (*shown on the screen*) will meet the design guidelines for new construction in the Lockeland Springs-East End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Motion:

Commissioner Kaalberg moved to approve both 1112 and 1114 Lillian with the conditions that a window is added to the left side of the building and that the drawings are revised to call out dimensions and materials.

Commissioner Cantrell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Mosley thanked the applicant for “sticking with us” and putting together a good proposal.

927 BOSCOBEL STREET

Application: New construction - infill

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: PAUL HOFFMAN

Permit ID #: 1960361

Paul Hoffman, staff member, presented the case for infill construction at 927 Boscobel. The noncontributing house on the site was administratively approved for demolition in February. The new building will be centered on the lot and meets the design guidelines for setback and rhythm of spacing. Gravel parking areas for vehicle access will be built at the rear of the lot. New sidewalks will be built from each unit to Boscobel Street.

The new structure will be 36 feet wide at the front and will expand to 40 feet at a distance of 30 feet from its front wall. It will have a height of approximately 28 feet from grade at the front, and reaches a maximum ridge height of 33 feet at the rear third of the house, approximately 76 feet from the front wall. Its height is within the range of contributing homes nearby. The size and height of the structure are appropriate for the context. Staff also finds the proposed infill to meet the design guidelines for materials, roof form, orientation, and appurtenances. The front elevation drawings do not clearly show capitals and bases for the porch columns, and Staff asks that the columns have caps and bases when built.

Staff finds that the proposed proportion and rhythm of openings meet the design guidelines.

Staff recommends approval of infill construction at 927 Boscobel Street with the conditions that:

- Staff approve color of roofing material;
- Staff approve windows and doors;
- Porch columns have capitals and bases;
- Double and triple windows have a four to six inch (4"-6") mullion between them; and
- Privacy fence to be no taller than six feet (6').

Meeting these conditions, the project meets the design guidelines for the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay.

David Baird, architect for the project, stated that he agreed to work with staff on all the conditions.

Commissioner Mosley said it was quite long but the square footage seemed reasonable and the alternative would have been a building that is taller and wider at the street.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the project with the conditions:

- Staff approve color of roofing material;
- Staff approve windows and doors;
- Porch columns have capitals and bases;
- Double and triple windows have a four to six inch mullion between them
- The privacy fence be no taller than 6'.

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

814 BOSCOBEL STREET

Application: Alterations -windows & materials; New construction - addition

Council District: 06

Overlay: Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1960776

Staff member, Sean Alexander, presented the case for an addition and alterations of 814 Boscobel Street. This is an application to construct a rear addition and to make some alterations to an existing building. The asphalt-shingle siding would be replaced with cedar shakes, the windows and siding on the left-projecting gables room would be modified, and a window on the right side would be replaced with a different sized window.

The house is a contributing one and one-half story Craftsman style bungalow, constructed in the early or mid-1920s. It is a contributing structure because of its age and architectural character.

Asphalt-shingles were a common siding material on Craftsman houses constructed in Nashville in the 1920s, often with decorative shapes and patterns. Without physical or historical documentation to prove otherwise, the asphalt shingle siding on 814 Boscobel is likely original.

In a Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay, repairs to a contributing structure must be made in-kind. It is not appropriate to replace materials with a different material, and it is not appropriate to replace, move, or modify historic windows.

The addition will set in from the sides of the historic house on both sides, and will have a gabled roof with shed-roofed dormers on each side. The gable ridge will be three-feet higher than the ridge of the historic house, but set back sufficiently and with the front clipped so as to minimize visibility. The she-dormers will set in an additional foot from the sides of the building.

Staff recommends that the eaves be lowered to match the height of the ridge, or lower. This is the only issue staff has with the design. The window proportion and rhythm and roof pitch (with the lowered) eaves of course, meet the design guidelines.

The cement-fiber siding, brick foundation, and asphalt roof on the addition are appropriate, but staff asks to approve material samples for color and texture, and to approve windows, doors, walls and fences, and any other exterior materials and appurtenances prior to their selection.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed addition with the conditions that:

- The original windows on the historic house are retained;
- The original wood siding on the historic house is retained, and that new siding is distinguished from the historic materials;
- The asphalt-shingle siding on the historic house is replaced in-kind;
- The eaves of the dormers are lowered to the height of the ridge of the roof or lower;
- Staff approves the doors, windows, brick, roof color, paving, walls and fences, and any other exterior materials prior to selection.

Meeting those conditions, staff finds that the proposal meets the applicable sections of the Edgefield Historic Preservation Zoning Overlay Design Guidelines.

Several commissioners expressed concern about the size of the addition in comparison to the historic building. Ms. Zeigler responded that it is a constant struggle and becoming more so as they are faced with more requests for large additions. Commissioners Mosley and Kaalberg stated that he agreed with members of Metro Council who believe that historic zoning is the wrong tool to address this issue. Ms. Zeigler also stated that their charge was to place an emphasis on how the change affects the historic building as seen from the street. In order to accomplish an appropriate massing in that respect, the massing gets pushed to the back. Commissioner Bell pointed out that the aerial shows there are other buildings as deep as what is proposed.

Preston Quirk, architect for the project, explained that they were in agreement with all the conditions with the exception of the asphalt-shingle siding on the gable-fields of the historic house. 603 Fatherland was allowed to put up wood shakes after removing vinyl siding. He didn't know if there were others who have asked to replace the asphalt shingles with wood shakes but they would like to use wood shingles. He further explained that the houses on either side are larger and will help to shield the addition.

Commissioner Mosley stated that it appears the historic asphalt-shingles were much thicker than what he knows of being available today and asked if there was something comparable. He thought that the thicker asphalt shingle was more in keeping with wood shingles than with the current asphalt shingle products. Commissioner Kaalberg said the design guidelines state that replacement material doesn't necessarily need to match in terms of material, just dimensions and visual characteristics and that there are likely to be other products that can accomplish this. Ms. Zeigler responded that Mr. Walker has said asphalt shingle has always been required to be replaced with asphalt shingle.

Motion:

Commissioner Fletcher moved to approve the project with the conditions that:

- The eaves of the dormers are lowered to the height of the ridge of the roof or lower
- The original windows on the historic house are retained;
- The original wood siding on the historic house is retained, and that new siding is distinguished from the historic materials;
- The asphalt-shingle siding on the historic house is replaced in-kind;
- Staff approves the doors, windows, brick, roof color, paving, walls and fences, and any other exterior materials prior to selection.

Commissioner Bell seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

2623 and 2625 ESSEX PLACE

Application: New construction - infill

Council District: 18

Overlay: Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay

Project Lead: SEAN ALEXANDER

Permit ID #: 1960893

The properties listed as 2623 Essex Place, 2116 Natchez Trace, and 2118 Natchez Trace currently have three non-contributing two-story duplexes that face Natchez Trace. They are to be demolished and replaced with three new single-family structures. They are non-contributing, therefore, demolition meets the design guidelines.

The review is for buildings A and B, with building C coming later. Buildings A and B face Essex, which is in keeping with the rhythm and orientation of the street historically. Staff recommends that walkways be added from the fronts of the buildings to the street.

Building A, 2623 Essex, will be a two-story house with a hipped roof and a gabled front stoop. The overall height will be 29 feet, and the width at the front will be 39 feet, staff finds this massing to be within the range of surrounding historic buildings.

The materials will include cement-fiber siding on the first story and wood shingles on the upperstory with an asphalt shingle roof and a parged-concrete foundation. Staff asks to approve the samples for color and texture, to approve the material of porch columns, window casing, and other trim, and to approve the windows and doors. Additionally, staff recommends that upper-story shutters be operable, or otherwise that they be eliminated.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed application to construct a new house at 2623 Essex Place, with the conditions that:

- The exterior materials including trim, columns, windows, and doors are approved by Staff;
- The color of the roof is approved by Staff;
- The shutters be operable, or that they be omitted; and
- A front walkway is added to engage the street.

Meeting these conditions, Staff finds that the application will meet the Design Guidelines for new construction in the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Building B will also face Essex. This building will also be two stories tall, with the form and general character of a gabled-ell Tudor Revival house.

It will have brick on the first story and cement-fiber board and batten above, with a fiberglass shingle roof and a split-faced block foundation. These materials are appropriate, but staff will need to approve samples for color and texture. The material of the windows and doors has not been determined, and staff asks to approve their selections as well prior to purchase and installation.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed application to construct a new house at 2625 Essex Place, with the conditions that:

- The color and texture of the brick are approved by Staff;
- The exterior materials including trim, windows, and doors are approved by Staff;
- The color of the roof is approved by Staff; and
- A front walkway is added to engage the street.

Meeting these conditions, Staff finds that the application will meet the Design Guidelines for new construction in the Hillsboro-West End Neighborhood Conservation Zoning Overlay.

Michael Ward, architect for the project, explained that the third building and the garages will be applied for later. He agreed with all of the conditions. The massing and form have a lot to do with the placement of the buildings on the lot. They worked with staff on height and the shutters will definitely be operable.

Commissioner Mosley stated that the layout of the three buildings is an improvement over the three non-contributing buildings.

Motion:

Commissioner Mosley moved to approve the two buildings (A&B) with the conditions that:

- The exterior materials be approved by Staff;
- The color of the roof be approved by staff,
- The shutters are operable or be omitted,
- A front walkway is added to engage the street.

Commissioner Kaalberg seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Kaalberg clarified that the motion doesn't include outbuildings and the site plan may require replatting if the property lines are found not to work.

Meeting adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

RATIFIED BY COMMISSION ON 4/16/2014